

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

holes, as asserted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Claims 1-7 and 21-28 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 21, 23-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 21, 23-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,012,386 to McShane, *et al.* ("McShane"). However, McShane fails to disclose inner and outer wells extending along a length of a periphery of a base, as recited in Claims 1 and 25 of the present application. In contrast, McShane merely discloses a plurality of through-holes 28 located within a periphery of a multilayer substrate 12. (Column 3, lines 20-22; Figures 1 and 2). One having ordinary skill in the pertinent art understands that a plurality of through-holes located within a periphery of a substrate is different from a well extending along a length of a periphery of a base.

Therefore, McShane fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 1 and 25 and, as such, is not an anticipating reference thereof. Because Claims 3, 5, 7, 21, 23, 24, 27 and 28 are dependent upon Claims 1 and 25, McShane is also not an anticipating reference for these Claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 21, 23-25, 27 and 28.

II. Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McShane. To that end, the Examiner has asserted that the use of flexible materials is obvious over McShane. (Examiner's Action, page 3). However, withholding comment on the accuracy of the Examiner's assertion, such an assertion fails to cure the above-described shortcomings of McShane.

Specifically, even if using flexible materials may be obvious in view of McShane, as the Examiner has asserted, McShane still fails to teach or suggest inner and outer wells extending along a length of a periphery of a base, as recited in Claim 1 of the present application. In contrast, McShane merely teaches a plurality of through-holes 28 located within a periphery of a multilayer substrate 12. (Column 3, lines 20-22; Figures 1 and 2), and provides no suggestion for any features extending along a length of the periphery of the substrate 12. Accordingly, McShane fails to teach or suggest inner and outer wells extending along a length of a periphery of a base, as recited in Claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 1 and its dependent Claims. Claim 2 is therefore not obvious in view of McShane.

In view of the foregoing remarks, McShane does not support the Examiner's rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,825,803 to Budde. However, Budde fails to disclose inner and outer wells extending along a length of a periphery of a base, as recited in Claim 1 of the present application. In contrast, Budde merely discloses a cooling member 5 having two conical bosses 6 extending from within a periphery of the cooling member. (Column 2, lines 64-66; Figures 1-5). Therefore, the cooling member 5 does not have any wells extending along a length of its periphery.

Budde also discloses that the cooling member 5 extends into an aperture 11 in a mounting panel 9. The only disclosed features of the mounting panel 9 are the aperture 11, the printed wiring

10 and the flexible foil 1, which are all located within a periphery of the mounting panel 9. (Column 2, lines 64-66; Figures 1-5). Therefore, the mounting panel 9 also does not have any wells (or other elements) extending along a length of its periphery.

Accordingly, Budde fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 1 and, as such, is not an anticipating reference thereof. Because Claims 3 and 5-7 are dependent upon Claim 1, Budde is also not an anticipating reference for these Claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to Claims 1, 3 and 5-7.

IV. Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Budde. To that end, the Examiner has asserted that the use of flexible materials is obvious over Budde. (Examiner's Action, page 4). However, withholding comment on the accuracy of the Examiner's assertion, such an assertion fails to cure the above-described shortcomings of Budde. Specifically, even if the use of flexible materials may be obvious over McShane, as the Examiner has asserted, Budde still fails to teach or suggest inner and outer wells extending along a length of a periphery of a base. In contrast, Budde merely teaches a cooling member 5 having two conical bosses 6 extending from within a periphery of the cooling member (column 2, lines 64-66; Figures 1-5), and a mounting panel 9 having an aperture 11, a printed wiring 10 and a flexible foil 1 located within a periphery of the mounting panel 9 (column 2, lines 64-66; Figures 1-5). In addition, Budde provides no suggestion for any features extending along a length of the periphery of the substrate 12. Accordingly, Budde fails to teach or suggest inner and outer wells extending along a length of a periphery of a base, as recited in Claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, the Examiner has

failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 1 and its dependent Claims. Claim 2 is therefore not obvious in view of Budde.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Budde does not support the Examiner's rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

V. Rejection of Claims 22 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 22 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McShane. To that end, the Examiner has asserted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a plurality of integrated circuit carriers, and that the ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify McShane therefor. (Examiner's Action, page 4). However, withholding comment on the accuracy of the Examiner's assertion, such an assertion fails to cure the above-described shortcomings of McShane. Specifically, McShane fails to teach or suggest inner and outer wells extending along a length a periphery of a base. In contrast, McShane merely teaches a plurality of through-holes 28 located within a periphery of a multilayer substrate 12 (column 3, lines 20-22; Figures 1 and 2), and provides no suggestion for any features extending along a length of the periphery of the substrate 12. Accordingly, McShane fails to teach or suggest inner and outer wells extending along a length of a periphery of a base, as recited in Claims 1 and 25 of the present application. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claims 1 and 25 and their dependent Claims. Claims 22 and 26 are therefore not obvious in view of McShane.

In view of the foregoing remarks, McShane does not support the Examiner's rejection of Claims 22 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-7 and 21-28.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES & BOISBRUN, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G. Parker', written over the printed name.

Greg H. Parker
Registration No. 44,995

Dated: 4-16-01

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: M.B. BAILLIE 2-2

PATENT

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

RECEIVED
MAY - 1 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

IN THE CLAIMS:

(1) Please rewrite Claim 1 as follows:

1. (Twice Amended) A chip carrier comprising:

a base[,];

an inner well [formed about the] extending along a length of a periphery of the base; and

an outer well [formed about the] extending along a length of a periphery of the inner well[,

the chip carrier adapted to hold an integrated circuit and adapted to have the integrated circuit removed therefrom].

(2) Please rewrite Claim 4 as follows:

4. (Twice Amended) The chip carrier according to claim 1 [further comprising] wherein the base includes an upper surface and wherein the outer well has a first base and the inner well has a second base wherein there is a first distance between the first base and the upper surface and there is a second distance between the second base and the upper [supper] surface, the first distance greater than the second distance.

(3) Please rewrite Claim 25 as follows:

25. (Amended) A chip carrier comprising:

a base[,];

an inner well [formed about the] extending along a length of a periphery of the base; and
an outer well [formed about the] extending along a length of a periphery of the inner well,
the chip carrier adapted to temporarily hold an integrated circuit in the chip carrier.